Interview Summary

	MATTHEW D. MATZEK	1794	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):			
(1) <u>MATTHEW D. MATZEK</u> .	(3)Dimitri Zafiroglu.		
(2) <u>H. T. Than</u> .	(4) <u>Padma Shah</u> .		
Date of Interview: 19 February 2009.			
Type: a)☐ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☒ applicant 2	2)⊠ applicant's representative	•]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.		
Claim(s) discussed: all discussed.			
Identification of prior art discussed: all discussed.			
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g) was not reached. h) N	I/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's discussed the differences between fuffeed/pile carnets and the claimed invention. Examiner stated that he was in agreement with Applicant as to the structural differences between the applied at and that which is claimed and would consider indicating the instant claims allowable following a formal set of arguments in the next amendment. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.			
/Matthew D Matzek/ Examiner, Art Unit 1794			